

Reply to Final Office Action dated February 13, 2007

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated February 13, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Initially, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 8-14 and indicating that claim 3 recites allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 is hereby amended. Support for the amendment can be found, at least, in Figures 4, 6, 8, and 10. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office rejects claims 1-2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,339 to Kenjo *et al.* (hereafter “*Kenjo*”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027579 A1 to Kwon (hereafter “*Kwon*”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

To render a claimed invention obvious, the prior art reference must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim. The combined teaching of *Kenjo* and *Kwon* does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites “a method for controlling a washing machine having variable speed tub and a variable speed pulsator” which includes “supplying water from a water pipe connected to a water valve to the tub.” *Kenjo* at least fails to teach or suggest this feature. Instead, *Kenjo* teaches that “the spinning of basket 2 allows the cleansing water to form the waterfall 24 and spray over clothes 25 from the location of water guard 23.” See *Kenjo*, column 7, lines 30-33. Note that the cleansing water is already inside the basket before the spinning. *Kwon* also at least fails to teach or suggest the above recited feature of claim 1. Instead, *Kwon* teaches a method of rinsing laundries in a washing machine with variable washing speeds. See *Kwon*, abstract. Therefore, *Kwon* does not cure the deficiency in *Kenjo* with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of *Kenjo* and *Kwon*. Furthermore, in a telephone interview on March 5, 2007, the Examiner agreed that the amendment would

Amdt. dated May 3, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action dated February 13, 2007

overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) against claim 1. Claims 2 and 4-7 variously depend on claim 1, and are also allowable over the combined teaching of *Kenjo* and *Kwon* at least for same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Mark R. Kresloff (Reg. No. 46,522)  
for Mark R. Kresloff  
Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant